

## Race to the Top Panel Review by Applicant



For Arizona, Phase 2

Selection Criteria	Available	Average Total Score	Average Total Score	$\perp$		Revi	ewer 2	2	Revi	ewer 3	3	Revi	ewer 4	4	Revi	ewer :	5	
Status		Tier 1	Tier 2	Соп	npleted	d .	Соп	pleted	d	Сот	pleted	d	Сот	plete	dl	Соп	plete	d/
				Tier 1	Tier	2	Tier 1	Tier	2	Tier 1	Tier	2	Tier 1	Tier	2	Tier 1	Tier	2
A. State Success Factors	125	95.6	105.4	91	96		102	117		112	121		86	86		87	107	
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	50.8	57.6	52	54		50	65		62	65		46	46		44	58	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4.4	4.6	4	4		5	5		5	5		4	4		4	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	35.2	40.2	39	41		35	45		42	45		30	30		30	40	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	11.2	12.8	9	9		10	15		15	15		12	12		10	13	
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	24	26	21	24		27	27		29	30		21	21		22	28	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	16.8	17.8	14	16		20	20		20	20		15	15		15	18	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7.2	8.2	7	8		7	7		9	10		6	6		7	10	
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	20.8	21.8	18	18		25	25		21	26		19	19		21	21	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4.4	4.4	4	4		5	5		5	5		4	4		4	4	
(ii) Improving	25	16.4	17.4	14	14		20	20		16	21		15	15		17	17	

student	
outcomes	

B. Standards and Assessments	70	66.4	67	64	64	70	70	70	70		63	63		65	68	
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40		40	40		40	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20		20	20		20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	Г	20	20	П	20	20	Γ
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high- quality assessments	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10		10	10		10	10	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5		5	5		5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5		5	5		5	5	
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	16.4	17	14	14	20	20	20	20		13	13		15	18	
C. Data	47	35	36.2	33	33	41	45	40	40		27	27		34	36	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	47	35	36.2	33	33	41	45	40	40	27	27	34	36	
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	17.2	18	18	18	18	22	18	18	14	14	18	18	
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3.8	4.2	3	3	5	5	5	5	3	3	3	5	
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	14	14	12	12	18	18	17	17	10	10	13	13	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	3	3	5	5	

(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	4.6	4.6	3	3	6	6	6	6	3	3	5	5	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4.4	4.4	4	4	6	6	5	5	4	4	3	3	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders	138	106.4	114.4	103	103	123	123	130	130	92	106	84	110	
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	14.6	15	15	15	16	16	15	15	16	16	11	13	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	6.8	6.8	7	7	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4	4	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	5	2	2	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	3.8	4.2	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	2	4	
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	49.4	51.8	51	51	55	55	58	58	38	43	45	52	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4.6	4.6	4	4	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	13.6	13.6	12	12	15	15	15	15	14	14	12	12	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	5	5	10	10	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	22.2	24.6	25	25	25	25	28	28	15	20	18	25	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	17	20	15	15	23	23	23	23	13	20	11	19	

(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	11	12.4	9	9	15	15	15	15		8	12	8	11	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	6	7.6	6	6	8	8	8	8		5	8	3	8	
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	9.6	10.8	7	7	12	12	14	14		9	11	6	10	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	5	5.6	4	4	7	7	7	7		3	5	4	5	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	4.6	5.2	3	3	5	5	7	7		6	6	2	5	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	15.8	16.8	15	15	17	17	20	20		16	16	11	16	
(i) Providing effective support	10	8.6	8.6	8	8	9	9	10	10		8	8	8	8	
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	7.2	8.2	7	7	8	8	10	10		8	8	3	8	
E. Turning Around the Lowest- Achieving Schools	50	47.4	47.4	47	47	45	45	50	50		45	45	50	50	
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10		10	10	10	10	
(E)(2) Turning around the	40	37.4	37.4	37	37	35	35	40	40	П	35	35	40	40	

lowest-achieving

(i) Identifying

persistently lowestachieving schools 5

5

schools

(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest- achieving schools	35	32.4	32.4	32	32		30	30	35	35		30	30	35	35	
F. C		40.2		40	40		F2					10	42	40	40	
F. General (F)(1) Making	<b>55</b>	<b>49.2</b> 9.4	9.4	<b>49</b>	<b>49</b>	H	<b>53</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>55</b>	Н	<b>40</b>	<b>42</b> 8	<b>49</b>	<b>49</b>	Н
education funding a priority						L					Ш					Ш
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	5	5		5	5	5	5		5	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high- poverty schools	5	4.4	4.4	4	4		5	5	5	5		3	3	5	5	
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	35.4	36.2	36	36		38	40	40	40		27	29	36	36	
(i) Enabling high- performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	8	8		8	8	8	8		8	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	7.6	7.6	8	8		8	8	8	8		6	6	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	8	8		8	8	8	8		8	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	6.2	6.6	6	6		8	8	8	8		3	5	6	6	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	5.6	6	6	6		6	8	8	8		2	2	6	6	
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	4.4	4.4	4	4		5	5	5	5		5	5	3	3	
Subtotal (Calculated before	485	400	420.4	387	392		434	455	457	466		353	369	369	420	

determining whether the applicant met the Competitive Preference Priority on STEM)														
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15*	15*	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	
Individual Reviewer Score (see individual reviewer technical review forms)	500			402	407	449	470	472	481	368	384	384	435	

Total 500 415 435.4

	FINAL**		Revie	wer 1	Revie	wer 2	Revie	wer 3	Revie	wer 4	Revie	wer 5	
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform	Yes		Yes										

<sup>\*</sup> Applicants are eligible for either 0 or 15 points in Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM. The total awarded to the applicant is not based on an average of individual reviewer scores in this section. Rather, 15 points are added to the applicant's Average Total Score if a majority of reviewers determined that the applicant has met the STEM criteria (indicated by the individual reviewer entering 15 points in that field). If a majority of reviewers award 0 points in this area, 0 points are added to the applicant's Average Total Score.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The applicant will be determined to have met the absolute priority if the majority of reviewers responded "yes".

